

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of NA'TTAZJA DE'SHARIA MARY SPIKES, NY'JEL DESHAWN GARY SPIKES, JODECI LAJAZMASINE SPIKES, LUELLA JANICE HEMMA SPIKES, and RANDALL DANYELL MITCHELL-SPIKES, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

RANDALL DONYEL MITCHELL,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

CASSANDRA JENICE SPIKES, GARY YOUNG, DESMOND BOYD, and KAWAN JENKINS,

Respondents.

In the Matter of NA'TTAZJA DE'SHARIA MARY SPIKES, NY'JEL DESHAWN GARY SPIKES, JODECI LAJAZMASINE SPIKES, LUELLA JANICE HEMMA SPIKES, and RANDALL DANYELL MITCHELL-SPIKES, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CASSANDRA JENICE SPIKES,

Respondent-Appellant,

UNPUBLISHED

June 26, 2003

No. 244257

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 00-393275

No. 244335

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 00-393275

and

KUWAN JENKINS, GARY YOUNG, RANDALL
DONYEL MITCHELL, and DESMOND BOYD,

Respondents.

Before: Sawyer, P.J., and Meter and Schuette, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated cases, respondent Randall Donyel Mitchell appeals from the order of the trial court terminating his parental rights to his minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), (g), and (k). Respondent Cassandra Jenice Spikes appeals as of right from the same order of the trial court terminating her parental rights to her minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (i). We affirm.

The trial court did not err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Respondent Mitchell has had virtually no contact with his child since she entered foster care, has not provided for her financially, and failed to take any of the steps that would permit her to be placed with him, such as maintaining a suitable home. Respondent Spikes only sporadically and partially complied with the requirements necessary for the return of the children to her care. Because she did not comply with drug testing, it is uncertain whether she has adequately addressed her substance abuse, and she continued to have mental health issues at the time of termination. She further failed to establish and maintain a suitable home.

Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondents' parental rights was clearly not in the best interests of the children. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Contrary to the contention of respondent Mitchell, the trial court did find that termination was not contrary to the best interests of his child. It cannot be said that, based upon a review of the entire record, termination was clearly not in the child's best interests. Similarly, the trial court did not err in determining that termination of respondent Spikes' parental rights was not contrary the best interests of the children. Therefore, the trial court did not err in terminating both respondents' parental rights.

Affirmed.

/s/ David H. Sawyer
/s/ Patrick M. Meter
/s/ Bill Schuette